

# IMPASSABLE

Issue #29, November 12, 1973

Chapel Hill Publications

Circulation: 110+

Impassable is a journal of postal Diplomacy published and edited by John Boyer 117 Garland Drive, Carlisle, PA 17013. Phone: (717) 249-1343, between 9 and 10:30 p.m., eastern time, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday. On Thursday, call after 10 p.m. but before 11:00 p.m. Sub rate to Impassable is 12/\$2. It is 6/\$1 for new bloods. This gamezine is a subsidiary of Chapel Hill Publications founded in March of 1972.

Diplomacy is a registered trademark for a game invented by Allan B. Calhamer and copyright by Games Research, Inc., 500 Harrison Ave., Boston, MA 02118.

## GAME OPENINGS AND NEWS

First, we have a small list of game openings for you. We are working on a new system of reporting openings and hobby news, and until that is perfected and put to use, we'll have to do with the hit and miss method: Domination, #5, Oct. 23. John Coleman, 837 Jos. Janisse, Windsor, Ont., Canada N8Y 3A7. Openings in 3-week Diplomacy, 3-week IV, Dublo (variant with first season being WOO), and SchizO-Diplomacy (another variant). GF is \$2. Sub is  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent per printed page + postage. He'll keep the books, you send the money. Very interesting issue and well done.

Adanack #1. John Hulland, R.R. #4, Guelph, Ont., Canada, N1H 6J1. A new title from this publisher. Sub is 8/\$1. GF is \$2.50. There are openings in both Algonquin Park Diplomacy and 473 B.C., two variants. Also has another zine, JOHNUS for players named John. Sub is 8/\$1. GF (for Johns only) is \$3. He's been trying to catch me--but no dice! Well printed expensively on one side of the paper.

Mordor Gazette, #6, Oct. 20, 1973. John Morgan, Box 253, Lazo, B.C., Canada V0R 2K0. Has openings in regular Diplomacy and in IV. GF is \$5. Sub is \$1.50/10. These Canadians are filling up my zine!

El Conquistador. Gordon Anderson, Suite #23, 24 North Wabash Ave., Chicago, IL 60602. Done offset! Has openings with airmail delivery of issues to you. GF is \$7.50. Subs are 14/\$2. This is one to get into--when the publisher has set money aside (HA #124) for 3 years of operation, it is a safe one!

Now for some news:

\*\*\*It has been leaked in Hoosier Archives that Rod Walker of Erehwon fame may be coming back. It appears that lengthy preparations have already been made and so it would seem likely that the rumor is mere factually valid! Oh well, If you want to sub to the revived Erehwon or trade or possibly get into its only game (a la H.A.?) which is doubtful--make that impossible as it is being reserved for those who paid for a game just before Rod left the hobby. The main point of this bit of news is that Rodney the Ex-God of Diplomacy is returning (like a Messiah?) to the fold. We remember with some nostalgia our first trip to the DipCon two years back and we saw him face-to-face. Anyhow, this man was partly responsible for Impassable since before I conked him out with all my questions about publishing, he was very helpful with all his answers. He and Don Miller of Diplophobia, etc. fame were two old-timers of the hobby, and I have a lot of respect for both of them. Well, we'll wait and see if Rod Walker will return before you get more details from here. If you want it now, write to him at: 3343 First Ave., San Diego, CA 92103. Do not send him any money, he'll let you know later if you need to pay anything. He is definitely worth recommending, but I really don't need another good competitor.....

\*\*\*We wish to thank many, many people for plugging our Impassable. All of those we have plugged in this issue have plugged us and we are grateful. It is nice to know you're wanted in this stabbing, conniving, murderous mob of men.....

\*\*\*The IDA's third election results has just been mailed to me in my capacity as Editor of the Diplomacy Review. However, I can't tell you who won if you aren't a member of the IDA. If you can't stand the suspense, and can't wait until the news leak out of a member magazine (like a month from now), then join the IDA! 1974 membership is \$2.00 and includes one-year (well, that's how long you're a member at the palsy \$2 rate) sub to the Diplomacy Review.

\*\*\*Some advanced news on the back issue problem for the DR. We were taking new members in the middle or later part of the 1973 and I had the awful job of trying to re-run copies

(cont. col. 1, pg. 12)

IN SEARCH OF QUALITY  
by John Piggott

((John is publisher of Ethil the Frog from England, and his article is his response to the discussion on gamezines and publishing))

I first discovered postal Diplomacy through science-fiction fandom, entering through the skylight, as it were. In SF fandom, one thing typifies the top, award-winning fanzines: the great care and attention lavished on them at every stage of production. Layouts are carefully measured up, material typed up two or three times before the final copy is assembled, and artwork run off separately, perhaps in multi-coloured inks. Those fans that can afford it, utilize photo-offset reproduction. Those that can't use their mimeographs with such loving care that the finished product can, in the best cases, look neater and better printed than many professionally lithoed publications. They're that good.

In Postal Diplomacy, too, there must surely be the same motivations that cause SF fans to labour so mightily at their fanzines. After all, if one cannot produce a fanzine one is proud of, why produce one at all? Publishing at this level costs money!

But the postal gamesmaster suffers from a handicap. He, unlike the SF fan publisher, must work to a deadline. His readers expect their game reports, and they want them more or less promptly. The games material must be typed up and reproduced at speed, especially if the publisher has other commitments. Elaborate experimentation in layout and the tender-loving-care treatment in mimeoing is not possible in most cases here. Yet still the best publications in postal Diplomacy look good and are well-written.

But what do we find? More and more recently I have found my pigeon-hole at college stuffed with publications which only a madman could call beautiful. Duplication is so shoddy that parts of the material are illegible. Grammar would shame a twelve-year-old. And these rags (for I know of no other word more suitable to describe them) give a bad name, I am convinced, to the rest of us.

Why do they do it? My own criterion in publishing is that I shall always produce something which I will never be ashamed of in later life. Usually, I think I succeed. Sometimes, I don't; an experiment goes wrong, maybe, or perhaps I just feel ill on the day set aside for typing. I usually feel rather apprehensive as I mail out a substandard issue, and if any issue turned out so badly I think

I might scrap it and start again, at least over the worse bits.

This is, I am sure, an entirely logical reaction. In a postal hobby, one's fanzine is often the only way a distant fan can get to know one. A shoddy issue could put about entirely the wrong impression, and when it comes to considering what other people think about me, I'm as vain as the next guy.

It's a paradoxical thing, though, that publishers of those zines I brand as 'shoddy' normally produce only one title. Think of the hyper-active publishers you know...Conrad von Metzke, Don, Turnbull, John Boyer...Their publications are always worth having, being well-written and good looking. Yet, with the care evidenced by their publications, one would imagine they had less spare time to produce extra zines than anyone else!

The secret is, of course, that those who have produced one good zine (and there is, I think, a certain talent necessary for this which you are either born with, or else you'll never have) are more likely to want to produce further titles because the rewards of their first one, in terms of praise from other editors, subscriptions taken, and so on, are much greater than those obtained by a mediocre publisher. Of course, after a time one finds that quality breeds quality; the better your publication is, the more likely you are to get good contributors, and birds of paradise don't feed on garbage too often. Which brings in more praise, more subbers....a positive feedback, in other words.

And my moral, I hope, is clear. It is better to patronize and nurture the quality publishers in the hobby than to enter a poor zine whose editor has few commitments. To be sure, a hyper-active publisher is maybe more at risk to the dropout disease (though personally I don't think this is so), but to compensate in any case one has the knowledge that with an active publisher, in general, the quality of material one is getting is worth the time one spends reading through it, and the shelf space it later takes up in one's archives.

--John Piggott, 1973

A NEW IDEA!

Impassable: Currently there is a debate on what additional services the IDA should offer to the hobby. Among the various ideas is one of helping to clear up the orphan games problem in this hobby by subsidizing new GMs to finish them up. The President, Edi Birsan,

(cont. col. 1, pg. 7)

### Game 73Ddl, Deadline is delayed

We are delaying this game on account of three countries (Leinster, Kymru and England) having missed this season. We are hoping that the player for England will continue, but it looks as if both Hilliker and Reinsel may not continue. Mr. Hilliker is apparently very busy with his new store, the Game Hut, and he has missed in all of my games and has been dropped from them all but this. Now, if he misses again, we will drop him. Mr. Reinsel has publicized in his limited-circulation (I didn't get a copy, but was informed by a player) gamezine, Big Brother, that he and I agreed to resign from each other's games. For the record, I never resigned from his B.B. #14 game and am moving to remove that game from his control. I was "kicked" out and so was another player on different grounds. In Special Edition #7 of Impassable, I mentioned why I was kicked out and the reason was that I did not immediately resign from the 1962-A game. Mr. Reinsel was thrown out of that game and threatened to kick those of 1962-A out if we didn't resign from it. Since I was winning, I did not want to resign and am trying to get Reinsel back in the game. I doubt whether Mr. Reinsel wants to be back in the game since he was being eliminated by my forces. So, he will "remain kicked" out of the game and thus he will not (most likely) put me back in the game he's running, of which I am also winning.

So, all in all, we can expect Mr. Reinsel not to continue along with Mr. Hilliker. I am asking (well, declaring arbitrarily) for a delay of this season so that we can get replacements. I am asking Fujihara, Richter and Gemignani to stand-by with moves. I am also going to make a general ple to the readers to send in stand-by moves if they want a chance to get in free. So, we won't know who's playing, but we will have one season of play and then I'll be able to give all names next issue. Until then, it will be formalized that I am hoping Mr. Fujihara will play Leinster, that Mr. Richter will play Kymru, and that Miss Gemignani will back them both up (you better, too, because I haven't heard from Richter this season in 1970BJ). Anyone else has a chance to get in if these people don't send in orders. All you need is the map and rules for the game.

If no one comes through, then we'll have to let these countries go into civil disorder. Okay, the deadline has been postponed and you may revise your orders, if you so wish:

SPRING 1017 is due November 30, 1973, noon.

### Game 1970BJ, Deadline is delayed

We are delaying this game upon request from the Italian player. We were also asked to make a final ruling on the Italian Fleet Smyrna of Fall 1908. We were told to be serious and to not hurry through with it. Okay, we had typed up a two page response, but we will mail the response to the player and just print a synopsis of the important points:

1) In Autumn '08 I erred in disbanding Italy's F Smy when he did not submit orders for the retreat, but submitted orders for the winter builds of that year. He had General Orders on hand. At first, I stood on the grounds that his G.O.'s did not give directions for retreats. He maintained that G.O.'s allow players to make a retreat even though they didn't specify how. I then considered this an "automatic retreat" solution and this was in contradiction to a houserule of mine in which I do not allow automatic retreats. Still, I have had no precedence with Houserules since I never had to use them before--the players who do bother to send in G.O.'s are the ones who don't miss!

2) The error was made three months ago in issue #25. After Issue #27 was published, I was shown by Austria to have allowed an Italian F Eas. I notified all of this printing error and this is how Italy finally realized what I did in Autumn '08 in issue #25. We had letters and phone calls about this and I thought we reached an agreement in which he accepted my error as a standing order due to my houserule #3.

3) After issue #28 was published, Italy brought up another arguement concerning, again, houserule #3. It revolved around the clause in which the GM would correct errors if it did not unduly disrupt the game despite the fact that it was reported and brought to his attention three months later.

4) My decision, after much thought, was this: I made an error which I am not yet sure is an error, but will grant the status as an error in A '08, issue #25. This error was brought to my attention after issue #27 over two months later. The player was, in accordance to my houserules, responsible for bringing this error to my attention prior to the next deadline (which was issue #26 and two months ago). He did not. The game's error thus became part of the game and a new balance of power was established as a result.

The definition of "disrupt" is: to impede  
(cont. col. 1, next pg)

or halt a normal continuity. The new argument from Italy is that if I do not replace the fleet, it would be disrupting the game. My answer is that due to his mistake of not informing me sooner, that his error has become a part of the game as much as any poor move would have resulted in the same manner. In consequence, the game has evolved a new balance of power and a new aspect for the battle of the Eastern Med area of the board. To add a fleet in Eas now would constitute playing favoritism with Italy and disrupting the current game! I, therefore, sincerely feel that a disruption was caused by addition of this fleet, and that the alternative of going back to Aut. '08 is also a disruption--both are undue disruptions of the current game. The "new" game, post-error, has become the legal game due to Italy's own mistake. The pre-error game is now irrevitable and also not desirable. In the same line, Italy's mistake not to bring my error up sooner has made it impossible to correct it without unduly affecting the balance of power. It would return it, perhaps, back to pre-error balance of power, but we can not play favorites and just correct the errors of one player--even though an error of our own was involved. At the least, G.O.'s were used to build F Rom. All positions, therefore, remain as reported in Issue #28 of Impassable. The deadline for Spring 1910 has been reset for:

SPRING 1910 ORDERS due November 30, 1973, noon.

Game 1972AZ, Spring 1909

Error: English units for two seasons have been unordered and unreported. GM overlooked listing A Edi, F Bot, and F Bal in W08 positions as a result. No change in adjudications is required.

AUSTRIA(Osmanson): A Boh S A Tyr/r/, A Ukr-War, A Gal S A Ukr-War, A Sev-Mos, F Alb S A Tri, A Smy-Bul via Ita F Aeg, A Ank-Smy, A Tyr S A Boh/r/, A Tri S A Tyr, F Gre S Ita F Aeg

FRANCE(Mahler): A Bur S Eng A Ruh-Mun, A Pie S A Ven-Tyr, A Ven-Tyr, A Apu-Ven, F Adr-Tri, F Nap-Ion, F Ion-Aeg, F Tun S F Nap-Ion, F Eas S F Ion-Aeg

ENGLAND(Wiskow): A Ruh-Mun, A Kie S A Ruh-Mun, A Edi-Den, F Nth C A Edi-Den, A StP-Mos, A Liv S A StP-Mos, A Mun-Boh, A Sil S A Mun-Boh, A War S A StP-Mos, A Pru S A War, F Bot H, F Bal H, F Bel/u/, A Lon/u/

ITALY(Hollingsworth): F Aeg C Aus A Smy-Bul

SUMMER & FALL 1909 ORDERS due November 30, 1973 at noon.

Press:

France(A Ven-Tyr): We remain England's loyal ally. Italy proposed a draw three issues ago, but why did he use our name? It seems DePrisco in EW is our only rival for the best France. By the way, I just passed my General Exam, which qualifies me to do research towards the Ph.D.

Garibaldi: Aren't you going to feel a little foolish, Howard, if Doug captures his 18th center before you overtake Austria?

-----  
Game 1972BG, Autumn & Winter 1908

Autumn 1908: England R A Bre-Pic

Winter 1908:

AUSTRIA(Pyle): SP

ENGLAND(Keller): R A Lon, F NAT

ITALY(Hrbek): NMR. Will be 2 short

RUSSIA(Fish): B F StP(NC)

SPRING 1909 ORDERS due November 30, 1973 at noon.

Winter 1908 Positions:

Austria: A Ruh, A Mun, A Ber, A Sil, A Boh, A Vie, A War, A Ukr, A Ser, A Bud, F Ank (11);

England: F Nor, A Den, A Par, A Bel, F Nth,

F Eng, F Iri, A Pic (8); Italy: A Bre, F Mid,

A Gas, A Bur, F Spa(NC), F Por, A Mar, F Con

(8) is 2 short; Russia: A Mos, A Liv, A Kie,

F Hol, F StP(NC) (5)

Press:

Vienna(LRV)--Nov. 22, 1908: The Dictator was in a very jovial mood today as he announced that the royal marriage between Princess Catherine and King Ginzo would take place as soon as peace is restored in Europe. There was a hint that the marriage might take place in London.

The Ruhr(LRV)--Dec. 15, 1908: At the big three conference held yesterday between Austria, Italy, and Russia, plans were prepared for the renewed offensive against England in the Spring. It was hoped that by Christmas of 1910, all English forces would be off the continent. The main debate was over the marching order for the parade through the streets of London once the city is captured.

-----  
Inflation: When you can't get something for nothing, but you can get next to nothing for something.

## Game 1972BW, Summer & Fall 1908

Error: Spring 1908 should list Rus A Ukr-Rum as failing and not succeeding.

Summer 1908: England disbands F Nth

Fall 1908:

FRANCE(DePrisco): A Edi H, F Lon-Nth, F Yor S F Lon-Nth, F Eng S F Lon-Nth, A Bur-Ruh, A Bel S A Hol, A Hol S A Kie, A Kie S Ita A Sil-Mun, A Mun-Boh, F Tyr S Ita F Nap-Ion

GERMANY(Davies): F Den S Rus F Nth, A Ber S Rus F Bal-Kie

ITALY(Lindauer): A Alb-Ser/a/, A Bud S A Alb-Ser, A Gal-Rum/r/, A Sil-Mun, A Tri S A Alb-Ser, F Adr-Alb, F Nap-Ion, F Tun S F Nap-Ion

RUSSIA(Knudsen): A Rum-Bud, A War S A Ukr-Gal, A Ukr-Gal, A Pru S Ger A Ber, F Bal-Kie, F Nor S F Nth, F Nth S Eng F Nwg-Edi /nsu/

TURKEY(Abbott): A Ser S F Gre-Alb, A Bul S A Ser, A Con H, F Gre-Alb, F Aeg S F Eas-Ion, F Eas-Ion

AUTUMN & WINTER 1908 and SPRING 1909 ORDERS are due November 30, 1973. You may make your orders conditional for Spring 1909.

### FALL 1908 Supply Center Chart:

England: Edi (0) Out of game

France: Hom, Bel, Spa, Por, Hol, Lvp, Lon, Edi, Kie (11) Bl

Germany: Den, Bar (2) SP

Italy: Hom, Tun, Tri, Vie, Bud, Mun (8) SP

Russia: Hom, Nor, Swe, Rum (7) SP

Turkey: Hom, Gre, Bul, Ser (6) SP

No Press.

Impassable: Please note I am calling also for Spring 1909 orders since the retreat is simple and that only one build is up this Winter. This should not make it difficult for anyone to make conditional orders.

## Game 1972CD, Spring 1908

Error: Winter 1907 should have listed England as building F Lvp, not A Lvp

ENGLAND(Schleinkofer): F Edi-Nth, F Bal-Swe, F Nor H, A Kie H, F Hol S A Kie, A Lon-Pic, F Eng C A Lon-Pic, F Bel S A Lon-Pic, A Bre S A Lon-Pic/a/, F Lvp-Iri

FRANCE(McKeon): A Pic-Bre, A Par S A Pic-Bre, F Mid S A Pic-Bre, F Spa(SC)-Por, A Mar-Gas, A Mun-Ruh, A Ber S Ita A Tyr-Mun

ITALY(Morris): A Ven-Tri, A Tyr-Mun, A Boh-Sil, F Tyr-Wes, F Rom-Tyr, F Ion-Aeg,

F Eas-Smy, F Con S F Eas-Smy, A Ser H, A Bul-Rum

RUSSIA(Brennan): A StP H, A War-Sil, A Mos-War, A Sev-Ukr, A Rum H, A Ank H

TURKEY(Nelson): NMR, A Smy H/r/

SUMMER & FALL 1908 ORDERS are due November 30, 1973 at noon.

Press:

Rome, Mar. 3, 1908: On to victory! The cry has resounded in this European capital as news comes in of successes against France and Turkey, with the aid of Italy's allies. Perhaps by the end of 1909 peace will have come to this war-weary continent--if the current alliance structure proves durable...

## Game 1972CJ, Winter 1907

AUSTRIA(Verheiden): B F Tri, A Vie

ENGLAND(Nelson): Out of game

FRANCE(Mahler): R F Lvp, out of game

ITALY(Lakofka): R F Eng

RUSSIA(Wrobel): B A Mos, F StP(NC)

SPRING 1908 ORDERS due November 0, 1973; noon

Winter 1907 Positions:

Austria: A Ank, A Rum, A Bud, A Ven, A Mun, A Apu, F Adr, F Aeg, F Nap, F Ion, A Bel, A Mar, A Pie, F Tri, A Vie (15); Italy: A Par,

F Tus, A Bur, F Spa(SC), F Mid, F Tun (6);

Russia: F Sev, A War, A Yor, A Lvp, F Lon,

F Nth, F Nwg, F Nat, A Hol, A Kie, A Ruh, A Mos, F StP(NC) (13)

Press:

The Nightmare Maker (Part IV): As Quincy the Nearsighted Frog drifts helplessly in the fog, who should appear but John Boyeruinforit who sings, "I know a place where screams are born and time is never bland. It's not on any map, but I sent you there, you sap, Nightmare, Nightmare Land."

"But John, I was sentenced for only one year." "Sue me, sue me, what can you do me?"

"Please, I want to go back to a rational world with Hugo the Baker, General Hatton, and Stephan of LWOW...err, on second thought, perhaps you could extend my vacation?" With that Quincy finds himself back in his own body. As he sits in the Emerald Palace in the Land of AZ, the sound of singing comes from the Yellow Brick Road, "We hear he is a whiz of a whiz, if ever a whiz there was..."

--to be discontinued!

Rome: Wrobel, you blockhead, you claim that  
(cont. col. 1, pg. 6)

you don't want a draw, but do you have to resort to a loss to prove your point?

The Dream Maker:

Stan Wrobel jumped from the plane and began to run for the underbrush. "No Rumble, run for the F-104 parked on the other runway."

"But, I know nothing about a jet like that, I only flew an F-86 in the Korean war."

"Don't worry Rumble, we'll 'fake it,' as you mortals would say." Stan climbed into the cockpit. A number of MP's had run to intercept him, but they had been foiled by Lendore who knocked them unconscious. Minutes later, Stan was at an altitude of 30,000 feet and moving at MACH 2.2 towards the United States.

"But, I thought we were trying to catch Sinestrae, and he was on Wake." "Was is correct, Rumble. He is aboard a commercial jet heading for the States. I can't detect exactly where he is because he must be aware of any aircraft approaching us and I have to help you control this plane."

The plane continued for about 30 minutes without mishap when Lendore warned Rumble that a wing of Interceptors was approaching them from the U.S. "I will knock out their electrical systems in a moment. Turn on your radio."

"This is Wing 449 Commander to base, We have the F-104 under our control. Over."

"Proceed to alternate base in Portland, Seattle is sacked in tight. Over."

"Roger, over and out."

"Won't the planes shoot us down?" "Without their electrical systems they can not fire their cannons or rockets nor can they communicate with base. They will follow us hoping the problem will take care of itself." They proceeded for another 47 minutes and passed over the coast below.

"You are 37 miles from touchdown, Flight R49. How do you prefer to land the prisoner?"

"We will have him touch down first, Portland." Within minutes a lone F-104 landed on runway J37 to Fort Nelson, Oregon. At the same moment Wing R49 went out of control and 4 planes went into an irrevokable dive towards the earth miles below. Stan's plane taxied far beyond the point he was instructed to halt at and Lendore operated to offset the forces chasing them. Rumble climbed out of the plane and ran for the fence. In a minute he was over it and free--free to pursue Sinestrae to whatever might be the final end of the conflict. --to be continued.

Inflation is when a man can lose his shirt not only in the stock market but in the supermarket as well.

Game 1972CK, Winter 1907

AUSTRIA(Chin): B A Tri, A Vie

ENGLAND(St. Johns): B A Edi

GERMANY(lindauer): SP

ITALY(Gershenson): R A Tus

TURKEY(White): NMR, will be 1 short

SPRING 1907 ORDERS due November 30, 1973, noon

Winter 1907 Positions:

Austria: F Adr, A Ven, A Boh, A Sil, A Mos,

A Sev, A War, A Tri, A Vie (9); England: A

Liv, A Nor, A Pru, F Bar, F Bal, A Kie, A

Ruh, A Mun, F Nth, F Mid, F Wes, F Spa(SC),

A Yor, A Edi (14); Germany: A Ber (1);

Italy: A Mar, A Tyr, F Nap, F Tun (4); Turkey:

F Rom, A Apu, F Eas, F Aeg, A Gre (5) 1 short.

No Press,

-----  
Game 1972DD, Summer & Fall 1907

Error: We're in 1907, not 1906

Summer 1907: Austria R F Wes-Tun

Fall 1907:

AUSTRIA(Leerkamp): F Tun-Wes, A Pru-Liv, A

War S A Pru-Liv, A Gal-Ukr, A Tyr-Mun,

A Boh S A Sil, A Sil S A War, A Vie-Gal,

A Bul-Rum

ENGLAND(Dick): F Nwg-NAT, F Lon H, F Nth-Edi,  
A StP S Ger A Mos

FRANCE(Fujihara): A Ber-Pru, F Lyo-Tyr,

F Wes S F Lyo-Tyr/r/, F Mid S F Wes, A

Bur S Ger A Mun H, A Mar-Pie, A Gas-Mar

GERMANY(Chin): A Liv-War/a/, A Mos S A Liv-

War, A Kie-Ber, A Ruh S A Mun, A Mun S

A Kie-Ber, F Yor-Nth, F Eng-Mid

ITALY(Roll): F NAF S Aus F Tun-Wes, F Tyr S  
Aus F Tun-Wes, F Tus-Lyo, A Pie-Mar, F Aeg-  
Ion, F Con H, A Sev-Mos

AUTUMN & WINTER 1907 ORDERS due November 30,  
1973, noon.

Fall 1907 Supply Center Chart:

Austria: Home, War, Bul, Ser, Gre, Rum, Cpp  
(8) R1

England: Home, StP (4) Bl, 1 short

France: Home, Spa, Por, Ber, Bel (6) R1

Germany: Kie, Mun, Ber, Hol, Nor, Swe, Den,  
Mos (8) B2, lost 1

Italy: Home, Tun, Smy, Con, Sev, Ank (8) Bl

No press.

-----  
Inflation is here when money that once talked turkey hardly says beans.

Game 1972DF, Winter 1906

AUSTRIA(Conner): B A Vie,

ENGLAND(Lindauer): B A Lvp, F Edi, F Lon

GERMANY(McKeon): SP

TURKEY(Blank): SP

SPRING 1907 ORDERS and votes for draw are due November 30, 1973 at noon.

Winter 1906 Positions:

Austria: A Tyr, A Pie, A Ven, A Vie (4);

England: A Liv, A Mos, F Spa(SC), F Mar, F

Por, F Mid, F Bre, A Lvp, F Edi, F Lon (10);

Germany: F Kie, F Bal, A Pru, A War, A Sil, A Boh, A Mun, A Bur, A Gas (9); Turkey: F Naf, F Wes, F Tun, F Tyr, F Ion, A Tus, A Boh, A Ukr, A Rum, A Sev, A Bul (11).

Press:

Vienna: Emperor William IV sadly announced the fall of France and French Premier Chic Hilliker. All of Austria-Hungary mourned the end of a friend of Austria.

Washington: President Howard Mahler of the United States recently stated that ex-Premier Chic Hilliker of France had been reported trying to buy a train ticket in Washington, he is said to have stated, "Blue Danube Waltz, Vienna Waltz--I have to get on one of them."

Constantinople: I agree Harvey. I would like to call a vote on a draw.

Impassable: What a Winners' Game for best finish would do for a guy's view of drawing??

#### A NEW IDEA, CONT.

has suggested that the IDA could help break the cycle of increasing numbers of orphan games in the hobby by giving these orphaned games to new publishers when they start out. The logic is beautiful and I can't see anything wrong with it!

By subsidizing new gamesmasters in taking over orphaned games, we reduce the possible addition of more orphaned games from these same new publishers. Also, an orphaned game is partly completed and will not take as long as a new game for the new gamesmaster/publisher to finish. This should encourage them to finish the games if they should turn out not liking the publishing angle. The average time for dropouts of new publishers is about the same time for the average life-span left of orphaned games! So, the two will tend to cancel each other out!!

Furthermore, we reduce the need for good, established publishers to take-over these

orphaned games and allow them to start new games. This would increase the level of well gamesmastered games in that more new games are run by established publishers. Meanwhile, the new publishers, if they don't drop out of the hobby, will have gained experience and recognition for their work. It will be much easier for them to fill up the new games that they start later on since the players of the orphaned games will be a ready and eager source of new players.

I know that I had a rough time in the beginning trying to organize my methods for doing things, and I also had a rough time in trying to gain recognition, and of enough players to fill my new games. Yet, I was one publisher who developed rapidly to a high level of competence. What about the average publisher who can learn and is willing to work to improve his product? Not everyone is a genius like John Piggott has brought up in his article, but with a little intelligence, you can learn.

So, this subsidizing of orphaned games for new publishers should help to eliminate the orphan games problem and reduce the addition of more orphaned games in the hobby. The established publishers will then not be overloaded with orphans and can start new games. A good idea, Edi, and I am hoping that the IDA will move fast on this idea of yours!

-----  
IN REPLY TO 'ANOTHER RATING SYSTEM?' BY WILLIAM CONNER AND JOHN BOYER'S COMMENTS  
by Lenard Lakofka

I am in agreement with John Boyer and William Conner that supply center ownership is a good criterion in awarding points in a rating system. (I agree partially because it is the backbone of my Rogues' Gallery Rating System.) The two problems I do have with Mr. Conner's system are 'National Difficulty' awards and 'Year Points.'

In the last R.G. readout, complete through Everything #14 ((a statistical zine put out by Conrad von Metzke--Ed.)), the following results were noted for wins only:

Russia	56
England	39
Turkey	38
France	34
Austria	31
Germany	26
Italy	22

In the four R.G. readouts thus far, Russia has always had most wins, England and Turkey (cont. col. 1, next page)

## LAKOKA'S REPLY, CONT.

compete for 2nd place, France and Austria compete for 4th, Germany has 6th and Italy is always last. This has held for  $1\frac{1}{2}$  years and an addition of 90 rated games to an already completed 214 games.

Therefore, setting Italy at '1' the comparative for the several powers could be set at:

Russia	2.5
England, Turkey	2.0
Austria, France	1.5
Germany	1.1
Italy	1.0

To show past performance these comparatives would have their reciprocals taken to give a just additive (or multiplier) thus:

Russia	4.0	12
Eng, Tur	5.0	15
Aus, Fra	6.7	or, to 20
Germany	9.1	give in 27
Italy	10.0	whole #'s..... 30

I agree with Mr. Conner that this should be an additive and not a multiplier as in the Calhamer point count system.

On the topic of Year Points, I am most vigorously opposed. It does not mean a tinker's damn if it takes Italy 5 years to win to 20 years to win. If anyone should get credit for duration of game it should be the top survivors in a long game not the winners in a short game!

Points for how many years a country was in the game relative to total game years can give a multiplier for a survival factor, e.g., if Russia is eliminated in F03, Germany in F06, Italy in F07, France in F08 and Austria wins in F10. Then  $3/10 \times$  Points would go to Russia,  $6/10 \times$  to Germany,  $7/10 \times$  to Italy, and  $8/10 \times$  to France. The problem, of course, is that longer games then give fewer points to countries that were eliminated quickly than in shorter games. R.G. subtracts points for when you were eliminated relative to other countries' eliminations. First eliminated losing most points, etc. I always use the game as a unit of time qual to 1 regardless of how long the game is.

## RATING SYSTEMS by Douglas Beyerlein

The concept of using supply centers owned as a means for rating a player's performance is not a new one. It was first introduced in 1966 with John Koning publishing a rating list in his zine, STAB. However, this idea

that a player finishing with seven centers did better than another ending up with four centers was refuted by McCallum and Calhamer in the late 60's. The distinction must be made between the number of supply centers a player owns and the influence that player had on the game. The Calhamer school of thought (of which I am a member) believes that either a player wins, stops someone else from winning, or loses. And the awards, or penalties, are given out accordingly. This has led to the design of the Calhamer Point Count List (CPCL) and the Organisation de Diplomatique (ODD) Rating System.

Other current rating systems use a modified supply center count. The BROBDINGNAG Rating System, also invented by McCallum and now maintained by Jeff Power, gives one point for each opponent beaten and subtracts one point for each player that beats you in a game. Thus the winner receives +6 points as he/she beat the other six players and lost to no one. Second place gets a score of +4 for beating five and losing to one (the winner). So on down to seventh place where that unlucky player was beat by all six and thus receives a score of -6.

The Rogues' Gallery Rating System (Len Lakofka) and the Lebor Gabala Rating System (Jeff Key) use slightly more complicated techniques in scoring players. Anyone interested in the exact mechanics of these two systems should contact their respective keepers.

There is a rating system which is based on the relative strengths of one's opponents. This is the previously mentioned ODD Rating System, which I maintain. The exact details of how ODD works can be read in WASHINGTON REPORTS #5 & 8. I will try to provide a brief summary. Players are initially assigned a score of 600. The winner of a game receives 50 points plus or minus 10% of the difference between the winner's and the loser's score (this is always in favor of the lower score) from each loser. Thus in a game where each player, including the winner, started with a score of 600 points the winner would receive six times 50 points ( $6 \text{ losers } @ 50 \text{ points}$ ). No points would be gained or lost because of the 10% handicap since the winner's initial score was the same as the losers. The losers get 50 points subtracted from their initial 600 points. Thus in this case the winner ends up with a score of 900 ( $600+300$ ) and the losers are each assigned scores of 550 ( $600-50$ ). Now if you have the situation where the winner starts with a score that is equal to or over 500 points greater than any of the other players, that winner will receive zero points for the

(cont. col. 1, next page)

## RATING SYSTEMS, CONT.

victory. This is because 10% of 500 is 50 and this is subtracted from the 50 points gained for the win resulting in zero points gained. With all six losers having initial scores of 500 points less than the winner's their individual scores remain the same from the loss. Three players have won games in which they received zero points for their efforts. They were Jerry Pournelle, John Beshara, and Edi Birsan.

As to taking into account the relative strengths of the seven countries there is one off shoot rating system that does so. This is the Weighted CPCL and it is run by Allan Calhamer in HA. As for my own personal beliefs I tend to minimize the influence of playing one country over another. Sure, some countries are more difficult to play than others and every player has his or her own favorites--which need not necessarily be the statistical best countries. However, in every game that I have been associated with I always felt that it was the best player, not the best country, that won. Thus a player factor is far more important than a country factor.

Perhaps an interesting side note is the fact that we locally used a modified average BROB ranking (+6 to -6) with both a player and country factor rating players in the Seattle Diplomacy League from '68 to '70. We considered this to be a very good rating system. Players' scores are averaged (number of points/number of games) and 5% of the difference in players' scores and country scores was assigned as the handicap. The only possible draw back to this rating is that it takes from 30 to 60 minutes to rate a single game. With plenty of free time (or a computer) and the necessary supply center charts this system could be used for postal play. If anyone is interested in this idea they should contact me for more information.

Finally, there is the matter of draws. Just a discussion on draws alone could run a number of pages if I were to go into all of the details. The most relevant point in regards to your discussion is the fact that in three of the five current rating systems all members of a draw share equally in that draw. A true draw (and I won't go into the matter of concessions) is when the game is stalemated either between two alliances or a big power and a coalition of small powers. Assuming this is the case then every position held is a vital one in maintaining the stalemate. The player with three units is doing just as valuable a job as another with ten.

Thus, they should be rated the same. In all McCallum designed rating systems (BROB, CPCL, & ODD) this theory of equality in draws is maintained.

Well, that is probably more than enough on the subject. If anyone is interested in learning more about the rating systems I suggest that they subscribe to my zine, WASHINGTON REPORTS, which discusses such things in horrifying detail.

((It is available at a sub rate of 10 for \$2. Send your money to: Doug Beyerlein, 3934 S.W. Southern, Seattle, WA 98136.))

---

## A CRITICAL LOOK AT "PHILOSOPHIES OF PLAYING DIPLOMACY" by Andy Phillips

((Note that this was written in August of 1972 in response to Edi's then brand new idea and his corresponding article which has since appeared in the 1973 Handbook.))

Despite its title, Edi Birsan's "Philosophies of Playing Diplomacy" is not about the philosophies of play in Diplomacy. It is instead an attack on one particular philosophy: the Balance of Power school of play (he calls it "Win Only", a particularly inappropriate name, presumably as part of an attempt to take the connotative high ground in terminology). Boiled down to its essentials, Edi's article attempts to make these points: (1) You should ally against Balance of Power players rather than with them, since if you ally with one he'll stab you rather than let you win. (2) That, therefore, you shouldn't be a Balance of Power player since that'll only get you attacked. Also, (3) that Balance of Power play produces long, inconclusive games which will bore and frustrate people and turn them away from Diplomacy.

Well, none of those things are true, although they've all got just a bit of half-truth in them to make for plausibility. I'd be the last to deny, for example, that if you're up on top of the game and rolling along in high gear that Balance of Power types are anathema. So much, however, for the truth in Edi's argument. The fallacy is the assumption that that is the situation you should be planning for in choosing an ally. The simple fact of the matter is that there are seven players in Diplomacy, and everything else being equal the odds are six to one against your conveyance being the first one to strike up a tune. Thus, if you ally with a bandwagon type ("strong second", Edi calls them...as if we weren't all for that) you're buying his

(cont. col. 1, next page)

## A CRITICAL LOOK, CONT.

complaisance one time out of seven in very dear tender--a tendency to defeat five times out of that seven. No matter what your philosophy, that's bad news.

Of course, if you think of yourself as a pretty mean player--and most of us do; a non-egotistical Diplomat being a contradiction in terms--then the odds start to look better than six to one. But the argument cuts both ways. Most early leads are two or more parts luck to every part skill, and if you are a good player the last thing you want to see is the bandwagon effect deciding the game early by atrophying the middle--and end-game before you have a chance to balance the breaks by showing your stuff.

Which brings us to the second element of half-truth in Edi's arguments. Well-played games of Diplomacy are generally drawn out and will often stalemate. That the game should be bastardized or that well-played games are unexciting or frustrating just doesn't follow, though! The name of the game is Diplomacy, and it is in the extensive multi-polar jockeying for advantage that takes place in the best games which really form flowers. And when you do win one, when you've talked someone into giving you just that little bit of an edge that he doesn't know will combine with a critical bit of undermining somewhere else and a tactical gain that turns up unexpectedly (or maybe just unexpectedly to everyone except you) and you slip into a position where you can just taste it, and they try to stop you and ah-h-h you squeeze it through the same...well, that is glorious, a real accomplishment. Believe me, I've won games going the bandwagon route too, and there is just no comparison. What talent, after all, does it take to offer someone second place when you can give it and he wants it and it cost you nothing. It's so easy it's a crime.

There is nothing quite as boring as the playing out of a game decided in that fashion, or where one or more of the critical (but not threatened, in terms of centers) players ignores the one in the process of winning in favor of grabbing a center or three. It can go on for years after it's all decided and there's nothing left to play for. And that's something that needn't happen, and doesn't happen when the players recognize a pressure on them not to lose. Then, its always down to the wire...take that pressure away, and you gut the middle- and end-game of all urgency and finesse. Over my dead body, Edi Birsan!

Less melodramatically, one of the best

reasons to adhere to the Balance of Power philosophy of play is that it is the one which makes sense. It is perhaps significant that Birsan didn't even offer a challenge on that ground. In any case, WARMONGER #2 deals with that and I've still got copies in stock, available for an 86 stamp.

((We have the following section from a recent letter that we received from Andy Phillips regarding our ideas on the "middle ground" players-Ed.))

\* \* \*

As to the "middle" argument, you're just not reading me literally enough. I too will sometimes accept less than a draw, but it has nothing to do with the question at hand. To say that there are "too many factors" other than philosophy is not to address the question of the cleanliness of the split on that one factor. The degree to which it is a yes or no question is unaffected by its relative importance to other factors. Verheiden poses the archetypal situation, and there is no middle other than to say "no opinion" and flip a coin or otherwise doodle.

Let me put it another way. There is no middle on the question of being in one school or the other. Where you get a statistical "middle" is from all the people who simply don't attach much importance to the question. And, "No Opinion" is not a middle opinion. It's another discussion. ((Answer to Andy: Who told me? Rod Walker! ))

((Hmm....Andy, if you were in the "Win Only" school, would you logically be willing to accept draws? I am taking the division of schools literally and that those in between the two schools are actually members of both. Win Only players could never accept a draw! This makes you a middle player as you have been known to go for a win instead of a draw. Thus, you yourself are a member of both schools depending on the game situation and are therefore my proof of my point being made! There! ))

## TWO QUESTIONABLE LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

From Howard Mahler: "The Inside View of B.V.D.'s"

Situations often arise in which a player has to make a decision as to whether to try to form a stop the leader alliance (hoping for a draw) or to go for second place (where by second place we mean that when the winner gets 18 centers the second place player has the next highest number of supply centers.) Given such a situation, the decision would

(cont. col. 1, next page)

## QUESTIONABLE LETTERS, CONT.

obviously depend on the specifics of the situation such as the actual tactical position, history of alliances, personal relations of the players, etc. However, it does seem reasonable that the decision would also depend on the player himself; in other words, each player would have a "philosophy". We mean, given a specific situation we could have some idea what the player would do, for example by studying what he did in very similar situations in the past. We'd expect to find the whole spectrum of players, from those who almost always went for a draw to those who almost always went for second place and every shade of player in between.

If you don't think Dippynuts can find ~~something~~ to argue about here, then you haven't been following the B.V.D. (Birsan-Verheiden Debate) featuring Edi Birsan, Eric Verheiden, and a cast of thousands. They ask such immortal questions as: Which type of player makes the better ally? Can a player be in between? Can his philosophy change with time? Who's on first? If we get a Ford in the White House will the Edsel make a comeback? To be or not to be....

From Len Lakofka: "I want To Be Third"

All of this polemic drivel about 'Win Only' versus 'Strong Second' Philosophies makes me cower in dismay. I've always opted for 3-way draws, that is--or coming in third. After all 3 is a magic number, "All good things come in threes", "There exist only three beings worthy of respect: The Priest, the Soldier, the Poet.. To know, to kill, to create.", "All Gaul is divided into three parts", "This is the 3rd time; I hope good luck lies in odd numbers....There is divinity in odd numbers, either in nativity, chance, or death.", "The third time pays for all," "...the Trinity; Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Amen." "...And each shall act as a check, to balance the other, three equal in power: The Executive, The Legislature, and the Judiciary"--I doubt if Richard Nixon believes in the divinity of the latter--Besides we've all had personal experience. Who wants to be first or second at an execution? Who wants to be first or second in a Russo-American Thermonuclear War? Who wants to be first or second on a national rating list? (Edi Birsan, that's who). So, I offer for your scrutiny, the always 3rd Award. "It's as good as a three dollar bill. ((Len, how about third place in Impassable's Game 1972CJ? How come only one hero in your Dream Maker? How come no 3's in your address?))

Some more humor....

### WHY BOYS GO TO SCHOOL\*

by Mark 'Casanova' Weidmark

(\*This script contains episodes of raw, lustful, passionate, gutripping SEX. Adults please turn the page.)

Speaking from the male side of the forum, I'd like to explain the real reason why we came to this school at all. Surely you should appreciate our efforts, since boys are made of frogs, snakes and things, according to the old poem, and it's a wonder Mr. Alix the biology teacher hasn't dissected us all by now.

No, the real reason, at least according to this friend I have, follows these lines: "This is my theory, which is to say the theory which is mine, achoo, cofff, I will now say, wheez, acchemmm, the next thing I say will be my theory, wheezz, achemm, my theory is as follows, yes, it is that the reason that we, the male of the homo-sapiens, come to school is for the bait. Now, this is no ordinary bait, but it's not so uncommon that I can't compare it to anything. What I say now will be my comparison, acchemmm, cofff, wheezzle, snifffff, er, my comparison, ahem, yes, the bait would compare with a certain brand, "CANADIAN TIRE CORP'N SURE CATCH FISH BIT--PRESERVED MINNOWS." The secret behind this bait is not the fish itself, but their attained added fixture. As you may know, the bait is stored in alcohol, and this is the secret. Pike, bass, and trout, well, basically, they are not alcoholics. The only vice is said to be smoking El Porto cigars. Now, usually, all they get are butts coming down, but should they see this long, derigible shaped thing,

(the minnow, er bait) smelling distinctly of alcohol (characteristic of El Porto cigars, which are rum soaked and wine dipped), well, they simply go nuts, and away they go after this prize cigar. (Really a smelly minnow).

"Now, us male homosapiens react in the same way to a different kind of bait. Specifically, it is the female homosapiens. Now, while the opposite sex is not rum soaked and wine dipped (though it would be nice), they are not without 'attained added fixtures.' These fixtures are not usually optional extras, but standard equipment, and they're 'busting' out all over."

And so there you have it, the real reason we males even bother to come, not credits, but girls. And for those of you who may alledge that my friend, is really the principal of our school, well, I really can't tell a lie.... acchemmm, coffff.....

The rest of this page will be excerpts from "The love life of a New York Prostitute....."

## NEWS, CONT.

everytime we got more new members. So, I then saved them up for doing at one time. This has since proved to be a bigger and bigger job because the IDA was jumping by leaps and bounds from under 100 to over 200 members. We are now in the process of figuring an easy way to give rebates, and to provide alternatives such as back issues at a much later date (we still have the stencils) or application towards

1974 or 75 membership, etc. A circular will be made for this expressed problem. Until then, please wait to hear from us. thanks.

\*\*\*Well, that's all for news right now. We as might as well get on to the entertainment features for this issue. Peace.

## THEM CHESS GAMES

Game #1: Wa-F. Harbor, El-Fobby Bisher

7. NxP KN-B3  
8. B-Q3 B-N5

9. ...

Game #2: Wh-Bisher, El-Bpasky

13. N-B3 B-Q3  
14. P-KN3 N-B3

15. ...

## IMPOSSIBLE PUZZLES

Puzzle #24: Jack complained to Jill that he had agreed to pay \$800 in cash plus a fixed number of bushels of wheat as the yearly rental for his farm. That, he explained, would amount to \$70 an acre when wheat was worth 75¢ a bushel. Since wheat is now worth \$1 a bushel (due to the Wheat Drain to Russia) he must pay \$80 an acre, which he thought was

too much. What is the size of the farm?  
Puzzle #25: A business man looks at his watch before leaving the office for lunch (and a secret visit to his affair). When he returns, he finds that the hour and minute hands have exchanged places from the positions they had when he left the office. a)Find the time when he left and b) the time when he returned.  
Puzzle #26: Put a dollar bill into a bottle, tightly cork the bottle, and remove the dollar bill without pulling out the cork or breaking the bottle.

Answer for Puzzle #23: By deduction process and elimination of impossible match-ups we arrive at the following marriages just prior to the mass divorces after the game:

- 1) Bill was married to Joan
- 2) Sam was married to Becky
- 3) Jack was married to Grace

## BELIEVE IT OR NOT FACTS

((From Guinness, 1973))

Longest War. The longest of history's countless wars was the "Hundred Years War" between England and France, which lasted from 1338 to 1453, although it is said that the Holy War, comprising nine Crusades from the First (1096-1104) to the Ninth (1270-91) extended over 195 years. It has been calculated that in the 3,462 years since 1496 B.C. there have been only 230 years of peace throughout the civilized world.

It is interesting to note that 230 years of 3,462 years comes to 6 percent. I suspect that most of those 230 years were in the beginning. This bloody planet might not survive 10 minutes of nuclear war--let's hope that never happens! More on war next issue in the realm of bloody believe it or die.

## IMPASSABLE #29

117 Garland Drive  
Carlisle, PA 17013  
U.S.A.

Your sub is up and you  
owe us another \$2.00  
We're begging you to  
standby for SSIII  
Are we trading?  
Smile! ✓

Complimentary copy ✓

SEND TO:

Rod Walker  
3343 First Ave.  
San Diego, CA  
92103

